

PUBLIC WORKS

AND

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Public Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, October 10, 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman • Chairman

Legislator Wayne Horsley • Vice•Chairman

Legislator Kate Browning

Legislator Edward Romaine

Legislator Jack Eddington

Legislator John Kennedy

Legislator Louis D'Amaro

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Ian Barry • Counsel to the Legislature

Kevin Duffy • Budget Review Office

Gil Anderson • Chief Deputy Commissioner • DPW

Lou Calderone • Deputy Commissioner • DPW

Catherine Stark • Aide to Chairman Schneiderman

Bill Hillman • SD DPW

Clifford Hymowitz • Chair • SCTAB

Richard Baker • Deputy Clerk • Legislature

Ben Zwirn • County Exec's Office

Gail Lolis • County Attorney's Office

Louise Stalzer • Peconic Connections

All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano • Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:50 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let's call the meeting to order this 10th day of October, 2006, meeting of the Public Works and

Transportation Committee. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Romaine.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. We have a fairly brief agenda. I think we'll be able to move through this quickly. We have no yellow cards, though, one of the people who I have down as the presenters probably is more appropriate at this point as a •• to bring him up during the yellow card public portion, so Mr. Hymowitz. I know you are here somewhere. Cliff? Is he here? He is outside, okay. No because we do have a presentation as well. I wanted to take care of Mr. Hymowitz first. He had, I think, one or two questions for us.

All right. Why don't we skip Cliff for a moment and let's move on? We have a presentation. I think it will be a fairly brief presentation by Lousie Stalzer from Peconic Connections. And she will be joined •• she will be joined {Joanne Mossimo} and by Stephen Petrowski from United Veterans. If you will come up to the front table. Legislator Horsley will be joining us shortly. He has an excused absence, be I think he will be able to be here hopefully for some of the agenda items. Why don't you pass that around? Let me give a quick little introduction to this.

Many of you have heard the issue about Sunday bus transportation. It's particularly critical out on the East End in the seasonal community, a tourism based community. We have a lot of Sunday jobs. And the Saturday buses are quite busy. On Sunday when they're not running, we see a lot of the employees of the area struggling to get to work often hitchhiking in the area. So we have been trying to figure out how to address this need short of providing a Sunday bus County•wide, which may happen over the next few years, it's possible with the needs assessment that's going on with the County •• with Suffolk County Transit.

So the United Veterans have been providing a limited Sunday service for some individuals to try to get them to work, and we've been talking about how we could expand that to provide •• to provide a limited service for more individuals. And Louise has been working on this with Tom Neely who is Southampton Town's Transportation Director and with John Lynch and others from United Veterans. And at this point, I will hand it over to Louise. But ultimately, what we're looking for is some matching funding for a grant that's provided through •• it's a federal grant, a JARC Grant, Job Access Reverse Commute Grant, that the veterans have. If the County could match the grant, we could get something up and running for next summer to meet what is a sizeable need. So, Louise.

MS. STALZER:

Louise Stalzer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we're looking at next year's budget and hopefully getting an Omnibus item that will cover this matching grant.

MS. STALZER:

Lousie Stalzer. I'm the Chairwoman of Peconic Connections. Thank you today. It's good to be here. Just briefly, Peconic Connections has been working on transportation since June of 2000 and has done some pilot medical transportation and pilot job access transportation. We've worked during the years and have subcontracted with the veterans using those veterans to •• that operate their transportation service.

When they received a Job Access Grant, they had asked us to begin to work with employers out on the East End. And right now, we are currently providing transportation for low income

workers. The vets are providing the operational service for employees of the Tanger Center in Riverhead. That's a pretty successful program. It does not duplicate the public bus. And it runs on those times that they cannot get work (sic). So it's a great starting place for us. And we're under discussions now with the Calverton•Grumman businesses there and how to make more assessability. And there is a public bus going there right now. So we'd be looking at •• well, there's different areas •• different issues that are coming up around that. But we are starting to look there. There are many •• there are •• we have been in touch with employers of over 150 employees there, low income.

But the purpose of this meeting today is to really take what we've done at Tanger and expand it and do it in a Sunday service. It would run for 20 Sundays. It would begin May 27th of next year. We don't have exact times right now, because what this would include and what we've learned is this interaction with the employers is so key, so important; what are their shifts? They're not all the same. You simply can't just put it out on what a few of them have, and their shifts change.

So we would working with this project, which has total budget of \$97,000 to provide the transportation for 12 hours a day with six hours in the morning, six hours in the evening, late afternoon that would that would match what the employers needs. The purpose is to demonstrate the need for transportation. It's set up because in Eastern Suffolk County it's much more seasonal in nature, it's where the greatest need is. In all of our time since we've been doing that, we've interacted with chambers, and they have been very much, you know, expressing a need for public transportation there. So this would, again, include an interview initially, we would come back with a more specific outline of the project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And, Louise, the buses and vans that would be used for this are all provided by United Veterans, so the funding you're looking for is just simply for the bus drivers and for data collectors and report writers, those types of things, right?

MS. STALZER:

The budget is basically \$72,000 for operational, and the other \$25,000 is for a big chunk for marketing. If we want to demonstrate, we need to market it that this service is available.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So people know about.

MS. STALZER:

And for salary of an employee Peconic Connections to do the interviews and to follow up with the employers.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And this federal grant requires a 50% match or something similar to that?

MS. STALZER:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So to make this happen, we need to match it. Now, can you just •• and I know other Legislators are going to have questions. Can you take us through the areas that this Sunday

service, this Job Access Transportation Service would be serving?

MS. STALZER:

Well, basically, the areas, you know, to do this in most cost effective matter would •• we're talking about running on the North Fork from Riverhead to Greenport. The areas that are marked there ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Can you point it out on the map there?

MS. STALZER:

We run from Riverhead to •• out to Greenport and then we run from Mastic•Shirley all the way over here out to Montauk Point. And then there would be a connector between Riverhead and Hampton Bays, which is here and over here. And the idea behind that with Mastic•Shirley, our initial discussions with working now on the job access, there's a lot of employees that come as far west as Mastic•Shirley, some of them here as far out as Southampton. So Montauk, as you know, has all the motels and businesses during the summer season.

Greenport has a lot of workers there. We don't have major •• we don't lot a lot of major employment centers, what we have is the King Kullens and the hospitals and the like. We have the Tanger, we have Bridgehampton Commons, then we have •• so we want to help to meet the needs of a lot of the clusters of smaller businesses in this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Louise, do those employment centers represent stops or transfers, I should say, so the Mastic •• Mastic to Hampton Bays would continue to go back and forth between those two areas and a separate bus from Hampton Bays to Bridgehampton?

MS. STALZER:

Yeah. Hampton Bays would be one of those transfer points that we'll have to look at carefully.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MS. STALZER:

Because the plan •• what we're trying to do is do this hourly.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And Montauk to Bridgehampton is a run •• a loop, so to speak?

MS. STALZER:

Right. Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And some of those will be buses and some of those will be vans depending upon ••

MS. STALZER:

Depending on what the demand is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The demand, okay.

MS. STALZER:

We know right way the South Fork will be at least two larger vehicles.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And again, to make this happen we would need to set aside some funds to match this in next year's budget. So we're looking for, I guess, \$48,500 ••

MS. STALZER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

•• in the Omnibus so that this could be put together. Do Legislators have questions?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Good afternoon. I just wanted to ask you how do you know what the demand is? You know, anticipating if you go 20 Sundays starting in May, how do you know •• have you done any kind of survey or study as to what the needs might be on Sunday?

MS. STALZER:

No, we haven't done specific on Sunday. That's what this project will do. But we've been talking to •• begun discussions with people for this job access, and King Kullen has a great demand for service. We know that's a business that's open on Sunday as well. There's no service, public transportation, available. So we're basing it •• we're here with a conceptual plan, but we're not saying there's no demand. We know there's the demand, because they're open. And we know that they have needs during the week. They've either reported it to us in the past or they're telling us now. So •• and we know that because the public bus doesn't go early enough or late enough. This is not the only need, but this is a major important need for Eastern Suffolk in the summertime.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, you cited, for example, King Kullen as a specific need. What other specific needs led you to the conclusion that there is a demand for this type of Sunday bus service.

MS. STALZER:

Tanger, initial discussions with Island Construction, talking to wineries on the North Fork.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So your group has actually gone out and did if not a formal survey, at least speaking to different businesses along this route and trying to determine whether or not there's any demand at all for this type of service?

MS. STALZER:

What we've done is we've intinally tried to go out to businesses and get them to pay the match. We find it very difficult when it comes to actually paying the match, so we've actually contacted • we've sent out letters to all the businesses on the South Fork, we out to visit wineries, we went •• we had a staff person go to the camps •• in some of the camps, and we have met with the employer of Island Construction now talking to Riley at Calverton•Grumman, I spoke to the head of King Kullen that's in charge of all the employers, and he said, "We definitely need the service." We've talked to Target in Riverhead and •• there's another one, but I can't remember.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I might add too on that question, the S•92 Route, which is a good portion of this, has seen extraordinary increases in ridership. And Bob Shinnick is here and he can speak to this, but we've have to add a whole bunch of extra buses. And when those people are asked why those the buses, most of them are non•driving. There's a tremendous amount of people. And the same problem exists on Sundays. They don't drive, and they need to get around. And many of them are working in various seasonal jobs like washing dishes in restaurants and things like that. Though I don't think we've ever done a formal study like interviewed the people on the buses in terms of how many would ride it on Sunday, we do see, as I said, quite a number of people who are hitchhiking around the area on Sundays. And we know that these businesses that are operating on Saturday are also operating on Sunday. So it seems pretty clear that the demand is there.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's the federal •• the federal grant you mentioned? This would be a 50% match from the County; is that correct? Has your organization applied for that grant in past or used it for any other reason?

MS. STALZER:

Joanne, you want to this?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

This is our second year with the grant.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the grant was used for another purpose last year?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

We did a West End Route the year before last, and we're doing the Tanger area now.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. And those are continuing?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Continuing right now, yes. Early morning, late night.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So how much of the grant from the Federal Government would be applied toward this particular proposal, the 20 Sundays?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

We're putting 50,000 aside.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's the 48,500?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Uh•huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And is there any comparison as to the cost •• I don't think you would know the answer to this, but has anyone looked at the cost to the County to provide the service as opposed to doing through this method?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

That's the idea, just to do until the County does the route.

MS. STALZER:

That's always the hope.

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

You know, if it's popular, you know the County would continue it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

One difference, the County would probably not just simply do a job to a •• you know, to a to•work •access program, they would do a Sunday bus that might be available for tourists and others. So this is very specific to getting people to work. So that's why there's no routes in the middle of the day, just in the early morning and late afternoon. So it may be considerably more expensive for the County to do a route. Again, Shinnick is here. But, you know, typically these things are losers in terms of it costs the County money. It's just a service that you provide, and it's going to always have to be subsidized. It's the nature, I guess, of public transportation. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, also, Legislator Romaine, I know has a couple of questions as well. I just want to follow a little bit on the track that Legislator D'Amaro had as far as understanding the outreach efforts that you made. And I guess •• forgive me, I just did not understand, I guess, the time frames that you would look to operate. Central Suffolk, certainly, I mean, you know, you've got a significant number of folks working there on standard shifts, whether they're 7:00 to 3:00 or 8:00 to 4:00 or what have you. Have you actually gone there and spoken with the Director of Human Resources or any of the folks that are associated with the employees that work there to gauge or get an idea?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry, Central Suffolk Hospital, you're saying?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MS. STALZER:

We have not. We have been working closely with Central Suffolk. We've made •• they're aware of what we're doing. They •• you know, but we didn't go into what their exact need is. Peconic Connections has been doing this for quite some time together with •• we were part of Peconic Community Council, so we have worked in the past with •• and provided transportation to Southampton Hospital, and, you know, the Town Hall with an employee shuttle. And we have done some advocacy work. We've spoke to the Montauk Chamber. It's never been any different than the need is so great out here for transportation.

I was on •• personally on the job access at NYMTEC where the RPA worked on a plan to say that we needed to have •• their employment areas out on the East End, we needed to have more transportation to consider some alternative types of models. And that's in a report that they did. So there's a recognition of the employment possibilities out here, the economic development issue, particularly during seasonal. But in terms of specifics, we're presenting this as a concept. We don't •• we don't •• actually we're clear on there's a demand, we just want to be as specific as possible so that we spend this money in the most cost effective manner utilizing an opportunity here. And also, to get data, we'll be very careful about data collection to begin to identify specific origin and destination sites, which we hope would be incorporated into the operational review that the County is doing.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Two things there. One, what is the hour clusters that you would look to go ahead and kind of initiate the project with, 7:00 to 9:00, 6:00 to 8:00, 3:00 to 4:00, what hours are you envisioning at this point?

MS. STALZER:

Beginning at 7:00, running for six hours until 10:00, 11:00, maybe 12 o'clock, and early like four o'clock. But, you know, again, I didn't want to give specifics, because •• until we talk to the businesses. And they vary, so, you know, we're going to be looking for those clusters and to look at the •• where the greatest demand is.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And what would you utilize as far as methods for information collection, trip collection? Would you be doing interviews with the folks that are riding the bus, or would you be talking to the employers?

MS. STALZER:

Initially, yes. That's a good question. Initially what we're looking at initial discussions with the veterans. You know, this could change, but what they're looking at initially •• there's a couple of ways we can go with this •• but they're looking at actually putting another veteran on the van and to actually do the collection of the data, because it's real important that we see where they get on where they get off. Short of that, I think it would be probably a staff person at Peconic Connections collecting that data on a weekly basis •• a Sunday.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is this something then that riders would be able to •• are they going to be charged for it, or is the free?

MS. STALZER:

Do you want to talk to that?

MR. PETROWSKI:

At present, the way that we're operating with the Tanger arrangement is that the riders purchase a

ticket of a dollar •• \$1.50 per ride. So it's not more than a normal fare of a bus.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It mimics what we have with our County transportation system.

MR. PETROWSKI:

Exactly.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And how does that •• what happens to the fees that you collect as far as the ridership now?

MS. STALZER:

That will supplement this service. We don't know how much that will be at this point, but that would be something that would need to be obviously clearly documented, everything will be documented as we do right now. We, you know, keep record of that. I can't say I'm going to •• we're to return •• that will go back to the County, you know, this money, because we need to be a little bit •• my hope is that we can use it for some operational and provide as much service as possible.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I wish we could say that would be more money, but even if you have, you know, 200 riders a day at, you know, a \$1.50, it's, like, what, \$300?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Gas money.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Exactly. Whereas, it's going to cost several thousand a day to run it. And again, although this is matching •• it's a matching grant, the veterans in addition to providing half the money are also providing all the buses. Kate?

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Ed.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Good afternoon. This is just for veterans, correct me if I'm wrong.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're wrong.

LEG. ROMAINÉ:

Tell me again the type of client that you're going to be reaching out for bus services? Anyone that has employment that needs public transportation?

MS. STALZER:

The majority under the ••

LEG. ROMAINÉ:

Under the grant.

MS. STALZER:

Yeah. Low income people, the majority of the vehicle has to be low income, am I correct?

LEG. ROMAINÉ:

Quite frankly, unless you were low income, there really would be very little need to take public transportation on the East End, because of the great distances, if you don't own a car, you're

stranded. And most low income people have difficulty even getting a car. What do you suspect the ridership might be, the average ridership, once this has been up and it's advertised, etcetera, etcetera? What might be, like, the average ridership per day?

MS. STALZER:

Well, it would depend on the route. But we anticipate the greatest demand •• in my opinion, it really is the South Fork and the Riverhead to Hampton Bays will be the busiest. But it will be interesting to see, because we don't currently have a South Fork run, that connection between Mastic•Shirley and Hampton Bays, one continuous run and knowing that we have employees there, it will be very interesting to see and I think a good test to see how that plays out.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Sure, because, by the way, there's a lot of people that would work, but don't work now. If someone talking about the cost of transportation, and if look at the bottom line, it's a loser. But that's if you exclude all other information for blind design. Because if you take a look at what it takes if more people were driving cars, the impact on the infrastructure, the road infrastructure, or if you look at the people who stay home, because they can't get to work or they don't have jobs available in neighborhood that they can walk to, because they don't have transportation and then they're on public assistance, maybe it's not that much of a loser.

You know, you got the •• actually, this will be interesting to see, because I'm looking at this not only from a transportation point of view, but to see how this will stimulate employers to hire people who normally wouldn't even be coming asking for a job, because it's too far away; Eastern Long Island Hospital in Greenport, Peconic Bay Medical Center, Southampton Hospital, any of the wineries, any of the supermarkets out there. I know the supermarkets in the summertime advertise high, high hourly wages, because they can't find people out there. And they actually ship people, I know people who live in my area, Center Moriches, that actually go out on the North Fork to work in the King Kullen in Cutchogue, for example, out there.

And then there's a lot of other things besides Tanger. If you look at 58, 58 is a major thoroughfare for the East End. It's got a Target, it's got a WalMart, Home Depot, all the major stores are there, and they are always looking for employment. So I'm going to be very interested to see this study, because I think it's going to talk to some of the transportation needs that have not been met on the East End, which I think is so important. And it may give people of lower income an opportunity to enter the job market if they had reliable transportation. There's nothing worse than to go to a bus stop and stand there hoping that a bus will come, and you wait, and you wait, and you wait, because there isn't a regular scheduled time. And sometimes the bus is a half an hour, 40 minutes off schedule, and that can be somewhat aggravating. But I'm very interested in this study, because I think it can benefit a great number of people as well as stimulate some economic development on the East End.

MS. STALZER:

You know, the S•92 it actually is very well •• a lot of people take that. And we're fortunate •• we're glad we have that service to build on. And, you know, from the Peconic •• from our viewpoint where we are at Peconic Connections, we're working hard on a brokerage model that would provide some alternative types of transportation for those costly connector buses. But this study is really looking •• you know, it's that S•92, that main service when you have a low density area to reach as many people as possible.

It's definitely, as you say, an economic development issue. And we really need to •• we have found somewhat reluctance on the part of employers when it comes to any kind of a match. So there's so many benefits for employers to learn from this, and this is a demonstration, but, you know, down the road for all of Suffolk County, is an increased employee pool, reduction of lateness and absenteeism, much more reliable source when you can have them to come (sic). And I think businesses also will be able to •• I know it happened several years ago out in Montauk where businesses were willing to adjust their shifts so that it could meet transportation. So there's a lot of avenues we can work on.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, flex shift is a very important thing, and I know we had it in the Department of Public Works. I don't know if the Department of Public Works is still using flex shift, but it's an important tool to be used. And I just would end by this, Legislator Schneiderman and I are working to try to get the County to do a pilot run for the S•92 on Sundays, because there's a lot of people that are left high and dry on Sundays.

And the other thing that is fascinating to me is Assemblyman Theile's proposal to create a Peconic Bay Transportation Authority and break the five eastern towns away from the MTA. I think it has a lot of interesting potentials. And I'm sure you know about that proposal. I think the more we talk about it, maybe the more likely it is that we can rally citizens and our State Legislators to work with Assemblyman Theile to create a Peconic Bay Transportation Authority. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Legislator Romaine. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Just a closing thought. I guess the request for funding always has more to do with, you know, what kind of bang for your buck are you getting really. And that's why I asked about the study or whether or not there was any kind of formal study done and the numbers. Just to make my point, if you look at extremes, if obviously only one person was riding the bus for \$48,000 it would not make economic sense. If, you know, 20,000 people were riding the bus, it would make a lot of economic sense. So it's important to have a handle on that demand and whether or not it's then cost effective for the County to go ahead with providing, in effect, a private transportation. I would want to make sure that there's a true public benefit, and we're not just benefitting a small constituency for riding that bus. So that's why my question about the demand for this. And if you have any other data or information on that, I'd be interested in seeing it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It really depends on the type of data you want to see. I mean, certainly if we ask that people who were riding on Sunday, would you take •• riding on Saturday rather, would you take the bus if it were available on Sunday, I think you are going to see almost everybody saying yes. And is that valid data? I don't know. Until you really run it, you won't know your actual numbers.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Did you say that you were conducting a study, though? You kept referring to a study. Just to clarify, what were you referring to?

MS. STALZER:

No. The initial getting information, working together with Suffolk County veterans before this proposal this particular •• not related to this particular proposal, but the similar kinds of things. What we're saying is that •• I mean, this is a demonstration project. We certainly are going to look to maximize the numbers. We do •• you know, in terms of actually data, there's not a lot of hard data. I can try to find that RPA study. We can give you the data that we have collected from Tanger just on a small scale. But the value of this is to demonstrate the need for public transportation. But this is 20 week project.

Anything that you do in something like this time to build up. We think we will have the numbers, because we're going to work hard to make this service available during the busiest times. But we're saying we're doing it to serve the most people, well, yes, we're doing that, but the primary motivation is we're looking at long term, demonstrating the need, identifying the origin and destination points and looking at the whole assessable issue with employees to employers.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What was the break down, just one more time, on the 97,000? You stated it earlier, I just wanted to ••

MS. STALZER:

Forty•eight five.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No. I mean, beyond that. You mentioned salaries, not providing the actual buses.

MS. STALZER:

You should have that in front of you on the last page, but it's basically \$25,000. It's outreach marketing evaluation. We anticipate probably between ten and \$12,000 in salaries, and the rest we're looking at actually paying for services. But I just need to get some pricing from the newspapers in terms of press releases and those kinds of things.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you're anticipating roughly 86,000 for marketing?

MS. STALZER:

No. No. Twenty•five thousand dollars for outreach marketing evaluation and 72,000 for the

operational piece.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So the operational fees are salaries?

MS. STALZER:

Yeah. The operations are the six vans •• six vehicles for \$50 an hour for 12 hours a day for 20 Sundays. It comes to 72,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, so you have to pay for the vehicle, obviously, is what you are saying?

MS. STALZER:

Yes.

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Salary, gas ••

MR. PETROWSKI:

Maintenance.

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Maintenance.

MR. PETROWSKI:

Of each of the vehicles.

MS. STALZER:

It's a good price.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're not paying to rent the vehicles, the vehicles are being provided? So we're paying for the gasoline and to maintain them.

MS. STALZER:

This is about as low cost as you can get.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And, you know, I'm not sure what to call this, whether this is a study or not. To me, this is a service. We're providing an actual service. But the data that is collected from this service will, I believe, be helpful to the County. The County Legislators, as you know, is doing a needs assessment of the whole Suffolk Transit System. And I guess the contracts are being signed or have been signed, but that's going to take •• Bob, what is it, 15 months or 18 months before that study is completed? Then we'll have some preliminary data maybe a year from now. But it may be true, and I think Mr. Shinnick may feel that it's an inevitability that we will have Sunday bus service throughout the County.

We have an interim problem, because that may be, you know, two years out, three years out, and it's an expensive proposition. So this addresses an immediate need for, I think, what is a reasonable cost to the County being that it's, you know, half the cost or more because of the •• not having to go out and buy the vehicles. It's being born by an agency outside of the County. So, again, the purpose of this is to hope that we could get some money put in the budget to work out the details next year so that we can have a separate approval process to release the money for the, you know, a very specific project. But if we can get the 50,000 into the budget so it's available so that we can provide it as a matching grant, then we can get this up and running for next summer. Thank you.

MS. STALZER:

Thank you.

MR. PETROWSKI:

Thank you very much.

LEG. BROWNING:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry. Before you go, we have one additional question. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm trying to figure out, it says six vans at \$50 an hour. Is that \$50 •• I'm trying to break that •• so is that \$50 divided by six? No? I'm lost. I'm just curious. What are you paying the drivers? What do the drivers get paid? Sorry, I'm a union bus driver •• was.

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

The drivers are veterans •• that's where the veterans come in •• from our program. They're in job training, and they would be part time, you know, either early morning, late evening. So they wouldn't be full time bus drivers. The point of it is to get them training to go on to other jobs, to be a bus driver, a CDL driver. It's an interim job.

LEG. BROWNING:

What kind of buses are they?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Vans, they're vans.

LEG. BROWNING:

What kind of vans?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Fifteen passenger vans.

LEG. BROWNING:

And they don't have to have a CDL license?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Passenger endorsement.

LEG. BROWNING:

So how much do they get paid?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

I'm not sure off hand, entry level. Whatever the prevailing wage is, it would be.

LEG. BROWNING:

Living wage or prevailing wage?

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Living wage.

LEG. BROWNING:

Which is a little over \$10 an hour.

MS. {MOSSIMO}:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

MS. STALZER:

We've been working on this with Suffolk County Veterans for •• since about 2002, 2003. And it has had very reliable service by these operations. And John Lynch has assured me •• head of Suffolk County United Veterans •• that they have the vehicles, and they'll have everything in place for this project. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Thank you. So we have no other presentations or cards •• actually, we have Cliff Hymowitz who we skipped over earlier who, I believe, had a couple of questions for us. Cliff, as you know, is Chair of the Transportation Advisory Committee.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

Thank you very much. Just two things I wanted to bring to your attention. As a result of the recommendations that we presented to you at the last committee meeting, we're hoping that at the next committee meeting that the recommendations will be adopted •• not approved, but adopted so that it will become, you know, a public document. But one of the things that has come out from this is how much of it is related to a public safety issue? And so I think you will find in the two other reports that come out will represent how much of that is evolved around that.

The other thing is that we successfully had a modification of the Paratransit Service Policy. Previously, if a rider wanted to seek an alternative reservation to the one he had existing, they had to give up their existing reservation to seek a better one, and, therefore, they could end up with no reservation. The new policy now is that the reservationist will hold the existing reservation and search for an alternative one. So I just wanted to let you now that things are positively happening from the study that we did •• you know, the information that we got at the public hearings. That's it. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions for Mr. Hymowitz? Okay. At this point, if I can bring Mr. Anderson forward. Gil Anderson is our acting Commissioner, acting Commissioner of Public Works. Before we hit the agenda, is there anything you want to say or just address things that come up during the agenda?

MR. ANDERSON:

With regard to the previous ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Not necessarily.

MR. ANDERSON:

At this point, I would say, you know, we're ready for any questions that come up.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me •• before we hit the agenda, I just want to thank you again for the work with County Road 39 and getting the cones back. You've made a lot of people quite happy. I know it's a little bit more challenging; you had to overcome issues of darkness and funding and staffing. I know you have a lot of work to do with getting ready for the snow, the snow fence to lay out. And I just appreciate the work you and your staff are doing to keep that project going. It's very important. As well as the long term project too •• or the interim project, which I know you'll be starting work on St. Andrew's Bridge before we know it. So that's all very well appreciated in my district.

MR. ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I also wanted to say too, I went out yesterday to visit the Third House facility in Montauk, which is under construction. They're doing a beautiful job. Really, it looks phenomenal out there. So I appreciate the work your department is doing there as well.

There was an issue that came up in the last committee regarding the jails; Yaphank and •• the Correctional facilities in Yaphank and Riverhead and the ventilation systems and some potential health issues. So I wanted to make sure you were aware of that and are acting just to make sure that, you know, in term of air quality, everything is safe for the workers in those facilities.

MR. ANDERSON:

Yeah. We have been monitoring it. I'm going to let Lou Calderone, Deputy Commissioner of Public Works address that, because he has more detail on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There was some testimony at the, I guess, Public Safety Committee about worker safety in those facilities due to leaky vents or roof pipes or venting systems. There was even a question of Legionaire's somebody brought up, which I guess is •• you know, maybe attributed to other •• something outside of the facility. But if you could maybe say a word regarding those concerns.

MR. CALDERONE:

Yes. If I don't remember exactly what the date was, but I think it was brought before this committee that there was a mold •• the issue I got involved with was the mold issue at the Riverhead and Yaphank Jail Facilities. And since then, we have •• actually, the Department of Public Works hired an industrial hygienist, a licensed industrial hygienist, to train inmates in mold remediation, keeping in mind that the inmates are responsible for the cleanliness of the jail and the custodial services of the jail. And we have successfully done that. As far as I know, it's been a successful program, and they've been remediating the mold, they've been cleaning it up. I don't know if it's done. I'd have to ask the Sheriff.

In regards to air quality, there is a Capital Program to replace the air handlers in the Riverhead Jail. And that's where the air quality issue had come up. And we've fast tracked it. We've taken it out of major Capital Program, and we're going to be doing the air handlers one at that time to move the project forward in an expedient manner. So if you have any other questions, feel free to ask.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, I appreciate your efforts. And I know that you're working doing the best you can with what you have. But at, I believe it was the Health Committee that I also serve on, I raised the issue that it would be good for the County to bring in an outside consultant to make evaluations of the mold and the air and make recommendations of what could be done.

I don't know about the degree of expertise, and I know that people at DPW appear to be jack of all

trades, because they really work on a whole scope of things, but what you really want in a facility that's holding prisoners that we have a liability and a responsibility for is that make sure that, you know, we have an outside consultant. Now, I don't know if I •• through the Chair, I see that Vito Dagnello is here, and ••

MR. CALDERONE:

Can I answer the outside consultant question?

LEG. ROMAIN:

Yes.

MR. CALDERONE:

The Suffolk County •• you're correct. That was at the Health Committee, I didn't remember which committee I was at. Since then the Suffolk County Health Department, in fact, did respond to that and developed a report on what they found, which were air quality issues and mold issues. And basically, we're using that report to remediate the problems in the jail.

LEG. ROMAIN:

Thank you. I'll turn it back to the Chair, because I see the President of the Suffolk County Correction Officers is present.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Vito, maybe you want to restate the concerns you brought up in Public Safety in terms of the

physical plant there in Yaphank and Riverhead.

MR. DAGNELLO:

The company, that Lou has said, to train officers and inmates, that was one class; three Correction Officers were trained, I believe six inmates. Well, four of those inmates have been released. That company is no longer being used. The County has said that they are going to use safety officer at Gabreski Airport. Now, this company that did the original training, that was the company that we looked at, we got their qualifications, their referrals, we saw that they were very competent and did a decent job in the other areas where they remediated the mold in situations.

We would like that company or this person from Gabreski Airport, the safety officer, to come into the facility. Well, first of all, the person at Gabreski has yet to give us his credentials that we've requested, and I believe Legislator Eddington has also, to see so we can check out and we're comfortable with his qualifications in training officers and inmates to do this. But we would like to see that one of those two individuals come into the facility and look at the problem and to know what they are training the inmates and the officer to clean. Nobody has done that, at least we have not been made available to walk around with them. Okay. That's the portion of the mold.

You can clean all that stuff up and paint it, paint over it, clean it, okay? Let me continue here. There's problems with roof leaks, pipes leaking, okay? Now, I have a sample here that, Lou, you were with us, when we told you that this was an area that was leaking. And you said and your men said it was taken care of and corrected. Well, this was as of last week, this sample. And we have a sample there that we can split this so you can send out. This is an ongoing problem there. And this is just one area.

So to hear that they've made corrections and cleaned up the facility, you can clean, scrub down the walls, you can paint over them, but you can't •• inmates are not going to fix pipes, they're not going to fix the roof, okay? And any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What's the typical process for that, you submit a work order, is that how it works, to DPW? You tell them you have a problem and then they ••

MR. DAGNELLO:

The officers do a tier inspection. And when there's problems with stuff ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They have some kind of log, and they log it in and you get to it in a certain amount of time?

MR. CALDERONE:

Correct. And to answer the leak issue, I want everyone to be aware it's a massive facility, it's used 24/7. There are always leaks in the facility. As we repair them, other leaks develop. So I'm not really sure if that's the same leak we're talking about. But we have repaired •• going back to our original inspection, leaks that were found at that point were all repaired, whether they were •• some were roof leaks, by the way. They were not all plumbing leaks, some were plumbing leaks, some were roof leaks, they were repaired over the summer. Have other leaks developed? Probably, because leaks develop in the jail, you know, constantly. So we'd have to relook at that. Keeping in mind that I haven't been personally notified. And, Vito, have my guys been notified? Have the guys out in the jail been notified of these?

MR. DAGNELLO:

More than once on this. And we were on the inspection tour, so were you, Ben.

MR. CALDERONE:

And like I said, we repair them as we find them.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have other questions on this matter. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. My recollection when this issue was first brought to us goes back to the spring, I believe.

MR. DAGNELLO:

January.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. It was something that was identified even in the beginning of the year. And there was some analysis that was done of the content of the mold itself.

MR. DAGNELLO:

Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And what some of the maladies were that could be caused from the spores themselves. Now, are we still seeing those types of molds that are available or there in the these areas that may be causing the upper respiratory infections and the other things that personnel were contracting?

MR. DAGNELLO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It's still going on?

MR. DAGNELLO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So how ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Everything's got to go through the Chair. Legislator Kennedy, are you finished with questions. Ben, I'll give you a chance to respond in a moment. Let me just •• will you suffer an interruption at this point?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I will, Mr. Chair, but I think the point is, is that, you know, we go all the way back to nine, ten, 11 months ago where we •• this matter was brought to our attention, it was something more than just some, you know, speculation or hypothesis, the science was done to go ahead and demonstrate, the personnel were being impacted, we requested that there be remedy, and apparently, the remedy hasn't been done still, because we still have personnel that are sick.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Has there been an independent air qualify assessment of this facility?

LEG. KENNEDY:

My recollection is that we saw something ••

MR. DAGNELLO:

The County •• the Safety Officer, { Alipo }.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's it?

MR. DAGENELLO:

That's the only person that's been in there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because there are companies that come in and do this kind of thing.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But the Corrections Officers, if I'm not wrong, did independently have some of this material sampled.

MR. DAGNELLO:

Yes. And that's where this sample is on its way too. We're going to have this tested too.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If you bear with me ••

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll yield, Mr. Chair, sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Mr. Zwirn, from the County Executive's Office.

MR. ZWIRN:

I took the tour, and it was •• we were not notified in January. We were notified much later than that. I think it was May that we were notified in. In June, I believe we did the tour. I can tell you •• you can go back and check, it was the hottest day of the year. It was the day, I know, that the Flight 800 Memorial had their •• their commemoration there. I remember it was brutally hot, and in the jail itself, it was about 70 some odd degrees. It was remarkable how the air conditioning system that's been •• you know, that's so old had managed to keep the facility relatively comfortable.

The Health Department was with us on that day. They were taking •• they were taking air samples. So the Health Department has been in the facility, it's not just DPW. And to be very honest, when I took the tour that day, as did Legislator Eddington's aide, it was not •• we didn't see •• you know, we saw some discolored tiles, there were no leaks. You're going to take a tour on your own, so you don't have to take my word or Vito's word, but you should go out and take a look at this facility. And it's remarkable how well the COs, the Sheriffs and the inmates there have done keeping this old facility as good as it is. You'll see that the dorms that they have rehabbed, and I mean the inmates under the supervision of some of the COs, have rehabbed some of the dormitories there that look like they're practically brand new. I mean so that, you know, with just a little bit of money, they've done some remarkable things.

You made a statement, Legislator Kennedy, about all those Correction Officers coming down with respiratory ailments, we don't know of those. That day we were here, we asked for a list of them, there weren't any. I mean, so what you are saying is just stating a fact that just, I think, is in question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do we have more information on that issue? Do we have information from doctors or something who have had patients?

MR. DAGNELLO:

I have officers, and I have set up officers to get screened.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Have people been diagnosed with respiratory illnesses?

MR. DAGNELLO:

They're in the process right now. Results have not come back from the screening process that they're giving themselves right now •• going to.

MR. ZWIRN:

This is since January, Legislator Kennedy, so they're going through the screening process now.

MR. DAGNELLO:

It's been ongoing. It doesn't alleviate the problem of what I have in my hand here. And us

standing on the second floor and being told by DPW when I was pointing to a pipe that was leaking and them saying it's not leaking.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Vito, I'm going to ask you to address us directly. Address the committee rather than the various individuals.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair and to Mr. Zwirn, what I am relating is my recollection from when I first became aware of this. And as to the notice aspect, I'm not going to dispute now as to when the notice was or wasn't. I know that Mr. Dagnello's indicated that there were previous or prior attempts. The issue is, I guess, we're here now and we're attempting to go ahead and try and resolve it.

But I think the concern that we come back to again is that even in our best efforts to go ahead and get an outside outfit and come in and go ahead and address it, if the best that we can do is get a couple of individuals and inmates who go out the door, how is this is going to be effectively addressed since in DPW's own words, it's a 30 or 40 year old facility, which we're under mandate to go ahead and construct new, because it's on its way out the door and it's going to chronically leak and have problems, how are we going to have one or two individuals who are supposed to have this high level or degree of certification address this ongoing issue? It's a matter of resources.

MR. ZWIRN:

Well, they're going to bring in a certified industrialist who is a specialist in this area who is coming in from the Gabreski Airport who is coming in from the Air National Guard who is a trained military personnel who I assume is good enough for the United States, you know, Armed

Forces, he's probably good enough for the inmates and the people who work at the jail.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll defer to my colleagues about military competence, some of whom are veterans. I'll yield.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have others. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Just a quick question. Let's talk about the air conditioning unit that kept Mr. Zwirn so comfortable during his visit. Does that air conditioning unit, in fact, dehumidify and is it as effective as most air conditioning units currently on the market for facilities of that size in dehumidification?

MR. CALDERONE:

Well, the answer is yes, because when the Health Department did their various tests, they also did humidity tests, and they were well within the ranges of standard building humidity of office building standards.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Lou, you know why I'm asking that question, because the humidity in the County Center ranges between 70 and 75% in the summertime.

MR. ZWIRN:

It was much better, Legislator Romaine, at the facility. And the reason I'm very sensitive to the humidity is because my prior business was in the confectionary trade.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Can't have sticky sugar or nuts.

MR. ZWIRN:

I'm just telling you, when we polished, you know, literally chocolate, the humidity had to be in the 55% range. I was amazed at how well on this day, it was a hot and humid day, it was amazing how well the air conditioning and the humidity •• I have remarked on how low the humidity was.

MR. CALDERONE:

There were issues •• just to explain, there were some issues of air handlers being off, exhaust fans, the air conditioning ran fine, we repaired the exhaust fan. This was the exhaust, for instance, shower, you know, steam, etcetera, to get it out of the facility. And, yes, we did find some problems on that day, you know, loose belts, etcetera, and they were all repaired. And when Ben •• that's the answer Ben •• when Ben went back to the facility, that's why it was in a lot better shape than we had seen it a month earlier.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. And I just want to say, I know Lou works very hard on behalf of DPW with limited

resources. But I'm concerned, and this is what I'm concerned, that there be an outside independent evaluation and a plan of work so that this is not a recurring problem. There has to be a plan of work. Having six inmates trained, four of which now have left the facility and having three Correction Officers trained on mold remediation may not be the most perfect •• perfect way of resolving this problem.

So I always believe, and I said in the beginning, when I believe the report came out, but someone sat on it for a month before even the Sheriff got it, if I'm not mistaken, and you could probably address that better than I could, Mr. Dagnello, but now that it's out, I think an independent evaluation and a plan of work, a specific plan of work would be well worth it. Thank you.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sure. Legislator Eddington.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Being one of the veterans, I was on the John F. Kennedy during Vietnam, and we had 5500 people on that. And every day, we had 5500 people working on the problems so it could never get into the situation that the jail was otherwise we would sink. My concern with the jail is this that what the people have been trained in is not really in remediation, it's in clean•up, it's in getting rid of mold. And we know the lowest way of doing that is with bleach, it does it, then you paint over it.

My concern goes to what Legislator Romaine is saying, that you are going to patch one hole, and

there's going to be a hole over here unless you have a real concerted effort to really do it. Now, I don't know •• I don't know if we have the manpower, but that's what I think we're trying to say here, that we •• I don't think the Correction Officers want one hole fixed and then we lok over their shoulder, and there's another hole leaking, because I'm not believing that it's a cover•up, you're lying, I believe that there's other things leaking. But we need somebody to really go in and do it, because as we said in the last committee, it will start to fall down around us, and we don't have the money to build a whole new jail. So is that what the plan is, to start looking at this?

MR. CALDERONE:

Yes, but I think we are confusing two issues. The inmates, again, are cleaning the jail. The Department of Public Works maintenance mechanics are the people that are responsible for repairing the jail. When I say maintenance mechanics, that also includes outside contractors, obviously. We don't do it all. It's a pool of inside help and outside help.

I guess what I'm saying is that the inside help and the outside help, yes, we are staying on top of all the repairs in the jail. Yes, the jail is old. There are •• you know, things break constantly. It's also the nature of the beast with the type of usage. But we stay on top of it, and not with the inmates. The inmates are, again, cleaning the jail. We stay on top of it with the maintenance mechanics and the outside contractors that are constantly repairing things that break.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. Vito, thank you for answering the questions.

MR. DAGNELLO:

I just want to bring up one more thing about the tiles that Mr. Zwirn said were stained. The first tour that went through there, Mr. Zwirn was not there. The second time it went though there,

those tiles were dirty, were stained, and they showed a presence of coliforms. When we sent it out for the testing that the County sent out also, and •• there was differences and downplayed on the report that came down from there but from the County. Oh yeah.

And what I'm saying here is just over that matter of months, the same leak that was said to be fixed the first time we went through there, within two, three months was leaking again. And that leak is a continuous leak. That is not the area where this came from, but it was the same problem. It's the same leak that was said to have been repaired. Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, I have one last question for Mr. Dagnello.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

My request is that when you get the results from this most recent set of scrapings that you make it available.

MR. DAGNELLO:

This is liquid.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Liquid, whatever it is. That you make that available for myself and certainly my colleagues if they're interested. And the other is if you get back any kind of substantive information associated with the Correction Officers' ••

MR. DAGNELLO:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

•• maladies, and whether or not there is, you know, some kind of a causal connection, I'd like to see that as well.

MR. DAGNELLO:

I will do that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, sir. Okay. And one other item before we start the agenda, I just wanted to

acknowledge the presence of some students from Suffolk County Community College from Professor Steve Shrier's State and Local Government Class are here watching government in action. That's three words, not two.

1645, A Local Law to reduce the emission of pollutants from diesel-fueled motor vehicles operated by or on behalf of Suffolk County.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The public hearing is not closed, we're going to have to recess it anyway. There's a motion by Legislator Horsley to table, seconded by ••

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

•• Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

1854, A Local Law to increase connection fees for sewer district contractees located outside the geographic boundary of a sewer district.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This also has been recessed to October 17th, so we're going to have to table this. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

1973, Authorization of alteration of rates for Fire Island Ferries, Incorporated.

This also has to be tabled for a public hearing. Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Am I wrong on that? My agenda says it's recessed to October 17th.

LEG. BROWNING:

I thought we closed that at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let's ask Legislative Counsel. I have recessed to October 17th.

MR. ANDERSON:

I believe that was the North Ferry.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We'll revisit it. There was a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).** We'll table it, and if it turns out that we can act on it, we will go back to it.

1977, To conduct pilot programs for S92 Bus Route.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine, what's your pleasure?

LEG. ROMAINE:

My pleasure is always to move for approval. That's why I introduce resolutions, and this is a good resolution that will allow us to take a look at running buses on the North and South Fork on Sunday. And we know from experience the heavy usage the S•92 route gets now six days a week.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is a fundamentally different proposal.

LEG. ROMAINE:

This is a Sunday bus service for S•92 as a pilot program to determine if there's enough interest. And I believe based on Jay's and my experience with the S•92 route on the East End of the other six days of the week, that there will be ridership there if the bus is provided. And that's why we would like to conduct a pilot program, and that's why I'm moving this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to table.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a motion to table and a second. On the motion, I want to say, first, that this is fundamentally different than the presentation you just heard. The presentation you heard was for a very limited service, not using the full buses, in many cases, using smaller vans, getting people strictly to work, whereas, the S•92, as you know, can be used for any purpose. That proposal was geared at low income and was targeted for, I think, a 20 plus or a 26 week period. This, I believe, is what, ten weeks?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Ten weeks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And it's basically to replicate the S•92 Saturday service on Sundays.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do we have a cost attached to this? I just want to make sure we understand the differences.

MR. ANDERSON:

The cost to provide the service or the cost too ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

To provide the S•92 bus route for a Sunday.

MR. ZWIRN:

I would ask the sponsor, he would know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Ed, do you know what the cost attached to it is?

MR. ANDERSON:

Actually, for a four Sunday pilot period, it would run about 24,000 for the County to run the pilot program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Twenty•four thousand?

MR. ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

For the ten week period?

MR. ANDERSON:

For four Sundays.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, for four Sundays?

MR. ANDERSON:

So you are looking at two and a half times that. So it would be 60,000 to run.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because, you know, one of the concerns I had with the other program we talked about and, you know, originally we had a shorter period in mind, then we extended it because one of the concerns that Mr. Anderson had brought up was what happens when it stops? What if you stopped it at the end of August? People still have to work in September. So we extended it to Columbus Day to take •• to match the real seasonality of those jobs.

And one of the concerns I have with this is that it stops. And if people start to get used to it, we're going to have a little bit of a problem. Not that it's a bad idea, I think we need it. Ultimately we need it, it's just a question of how should we best proceed right now. Should we use this model or should we use a model where another entity provides the immediate need?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I don't know if the Veterans Service operation that we heard of today was talking about running on Sundays. I think they were talking about ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It was Sundays. Strictly Sundays.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, I'd allow this to be tabled pending funding of the other one in the budget that we could use. Look, I don't want to run up the cost of anything, but I do •• I do believe that there is a desperate need for transportation for people that are low income who don't have cars that are stuck out on the East End that need to get to work, that help the economy, that need to go and shop and do other things that they don't have the ability to do. I'm trying to address not only those who have the wealth and the ability to afford a car, but those who don't.

And I think having no public transportation for a large geographic area •• I understand we don't have a lot of population there, but the five Eastern Towns are probably a good 45% percent of the geographic mass of Suffolk County, if not larger. And we have large areas there where we have no public transportation. And that leaves anyone of limited means stranded really on Sunday, because they don't even have an alternative.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, just one other comment. To me, this is preferable even than to what we heard, but this is, I believe, going to be much more expensive to match the same level of service. So I thought to go about it using the Veterans Group might be more palatable to the Legislature to deal with the interim need and, you know ••

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, you and I are both conscious, of course, and we don't want to be irresponsible and we don't want to spend money that the County may not want to spend, so I'd be willing to table this pending, pending the funding of the Veterans operation. And then I will tell you, when those

reports come in, if they argue for extended ridership on Sunday, then I'll make that argument again, because there are people out there without a means of transportation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy then D'Amaro.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, what I would suggest with this resolution is that it is good, and I commend you or whoever it was for inviting Peconic to come in here and to present to us. But I would offer to you that there are overlapping constituencies that you would look at, not only would you have Sunday workers who would be utilizing this, but all your nondrivers; senior citizens who are nondrivers, handicapped individuals who are nondrivers, folks that are going to do shopping and things like that. So it would be a much broader group.

I also think that when you compare the two proposals, our costs are very well honed and defined associated with our County transit system, and it's been subject to competitive bidding already. I admire Peconic for being a group that brings forward, I guess, initiatives, but I would question some of their mathematics. I think some of it is a little elusive, to say the best. So I think that this proposal probably does have a quite a bit of merit, and, of course, I'll defer to the sponsor if his desire is to go ahead and table. But I think it's important to understand that these two proposals that are pending in front of us are not complete mirror images at all. So the information that comes forward, I think still needs to be looked at as far as the greater benefit.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The other proposal included the Mastic•Shirley area, which this does not. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I just wanted to ask, I know we've had this discussion about this debate several times, and I think my conclusion, and, Mr. Zwirn, correct me if I'm wrong, but isn't the County already looking at this globally, aren't we already conducting studies to see whether or not we need additional bus routes or Sunday routes or things like that?

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes, we're doing a study, but this was more in the lines of doing an actual program. If I can could just interject. Every district has King Kullens, every district has hotels, every district has stores and things that are open on Sunday, why would you want to isolate this just to the East End? I mean, If you have it in the East End, wouldn't the district •• Legislator Kennedy, wouldn't the people in your community say, "Well, if you've got out in East Hampton, how come we can't get our people to work as well"? This would be in all 18 •• you might as well make it County•wide, and there's no money for this.

LEG. ROMAINE:

There's no money for anything, Ben.

MR. ZWIRN:

Well, there's no money •• you proposed a bill here, in your legislation, you provide no money to pay for it. I mean, it's going to come from the taxpayers, but you've got to figure out where it's going to come from. You know, you're got money in there for a whole bunch of bills, all great causes. You could fund ten million causes in this County, and nobody would say that's bad idea. The question is trying to balance everything and have priorities. If you're going to do it here, the County Executive said •• you're not going to do it •• why would you not want it? Why wouldn't

Legislator D'Amaro want it in his area? Why wouldn't the residents in Legislator Eddington's district say, "Well, if you have it out there, what's wrong with us? Are we second-class citizens? You're going to have Sunday service out there, why not here"?

That's why I would say in keep with what Legislator D'Amaro said, we have a study going on looking at needs across the County, let's take a look at it. I mean, if it's time for Sunday bus service in Suffolk County, the Legislature and the County Executive will find money for it without raising taxes or with raising taxes, I think that's that important, and that's within your prerogative.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I just want to say one thing addressing that. The East End is slightly different in terms of the number of seasonal jobs, and that it's a tourism economy, in that you have a lot of weekends jobs and also the distance that people have to travel to get to work in terms of a lot of those low wage jobs really just simply live anywhere near the employment centers. And so I think there •• not that you don't have some of those conditions elsewhere, it's just the level of those conditions I think are somewhat unique to the East End of Long Island.

MR. ZWIRN:

Legislator Schneiderman, keeping with the fiscal •• I had a business. Very few of the people who worked in my business lived around the corner. They had to come from areas several miles away, and Nassau County's public transportation system was no whiz bang as well. We provided transportation, we got people to work. Publishers Clearinghouse, which is a very large employer,

was right behind us, they got their own buses and bused people in. If you •• if you have to get people to work, you can do it. And these are •• and this is inexpensive labor, because this is cheap labor that we're bringing out to these areas, because they can't afford any other way to get there.

A lot of the big resorts on the East End or King Kullen, I mean, can find ways •• they're getting their employees there now. I mean, so this isn't something that's, you know, apparently life or death at this minute. It's something to be taken up during the budget process. We've got a global study going on. I'm not suggesting that maybe the time hasn't come to take a look at Sunday bus service County•wide, maybe that's •• maybe that's something that the day has come. But that something that this Legislature as a group is going to have to come to grips with and find the money to pay for it, because it's not going to be inexpensive.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Again, part of you your comments, I think, you know, in the grand scheme of things, they resonate. I understand that. Would the residents of the 12th Legislative District like to have Sunday bus service? I've gotten the e•mails, and as a matter of fact, I've been asked and requested primarily from those folks who are nondrivers, those folks who are handicapped, those folks who would like to go ahead and have later service in the evenings, even from Monday to Saturday. Yeah, I think that we talk a lot about bus service, and I eagerly wait for the results of this study that's going to run for 18 to 24 months.

So if looking at two years from now to continue to discuss Sunday service is the answer, I don't think it is an answer. I think what we're looking at is, as Legislator Schneiderman and Romaine pointed out, there are some unique differences there on the East End. I don't have three hospitals

sitting in my Legislative District that have 24/7 employment with folks running around the clock. There aren't a whole lot of resorts in the southern Smithtown or Commack area. So I think there it's reasonable to look at some of the differences that are there to some of the differences that I have and the rest of us have.

I just think that what happens is we are too quick to go ahead and say we'll look to the study to go ahead and give us the answers when the study is not going to be to us for another one, two, two and a half years sometimes, sometimes it's too long to wait.

MR. ZWIRN:

But you would agree that you would have to have the money to do it. Whatever you're going to do, you have to have the money to pay for it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We should always have the money to pay for this. As a matter of fact, we have to make hard decisions every day as to what we do pay for and what we don't pay for. Agreed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, the presentation that was that was made earlier has got a 50% match.

MR. ZWIRN:

I'm not talking about that one, I'm talking about this ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's a limited service. We've done everything to keep the cost down to the County. Yes, ultimately ••

MR. ZWIRN:

I'm talking about the legislation that's before the committee now.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It would have to be paid for.

MR. ZWIRN:

But it's not spelled out.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, but all public transportation is going to have to be subsidized. I don't want to make an argument against public transportation. We are in the business of providing needed services to our residents. If there is a need, we need to try to meet that need. And you're right, it might lead to increased taxes, but this is •• the proposal that was laid out earlier, that \$50,000 proposal, and we look to look at the budget and see if it's •• it can be done with the County's means. I suspect it can. Okay. There has been a motion to table and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? All right. 1977 is **tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**.

1984, To transfer portion of CR 63 (Peconic Avenue) to the Town of Riverhead.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Again, for the purposes of discussion, I'll move to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'll offer a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a motion to approve and a motion to table. Is there a second to either one of those?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A seconding to the tabling motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll second to approve for the purposes of discussion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The tabling motion takes presence. On the tabling motion, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. The Town of Riverhead by resolution and by letter, which every member of this committee has received, has asked for the County to transfer that portion of CR 63, which is about 200, maybe 250 feet at best, from the County to the Town of Riverhead. Now, normally when it was first brought in front of this committee, everyone said, wow, that's a great thing. You know, the town is willing to take over some County responsibility. But then some questions came up that Public Works •• which originally in their correspondence of January or earlier this year was favorable •• changed their mind because they had other conditions. The other condition is they wanted them to take over the Southampton side of CR 63.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just because we've been through this so many times, and I would love to get some kind of resolution to this matter, I mean, if the County doesn't want to give it up, why does the town want it? And if they have certain things they want to do differently, why can't they get into a discussion ••

LEG. ROMAINE:

I guess it's part •• would be part of their downtown revitalization. But if this is a moot point that the Public Works is going to oppose this, I mean, obviously we won't accommodate the Town of Riverhead.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm just wondering, if the Town of Riverhead has some issues with the way the County is maintaining it or wants to do something fundamentally different with the road, they ought to come to the table with the County DPW and •• maybe we can work those things out with the County continuing to own it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, at this point, I guess the best person to speak is Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON:

The issues that raised this resolution were based out of a permit to, you know, do work on a County Road at their Riverside Park. We had a disagreement in how cars should egress the park on to the road, and that's how the whole thing developed.

At our last meeting, we said we would discuss with Riverhead and we are in discussions with the town engineer and the town attorney two ways of handling this; one, to reach a maintenance agreement with them. Right now we've •• their attorneys •• and we're approaching the County Attorneys as well •• to look at liability issues about who is responsible. We've taken the whole issues •• just so you know, the whole issue of the culverts out of there. No matter what happens, we still want to main that culvert.

As far as •• I won't belabor the reasons we're against it. I mean, it's on the record, but we are •• just so you know, we are in discussions with them to discuss if we reach an intermunicipal agreement and they just maintain that portion of it, is that to cover our liabilities and to cover their liabilities. And if I could ask for it to be tabled until we resolve it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Based on what the Commissioner said, I withdraw my motion to approve if Mr. Kennedy will withdraw his second, and we'll move to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It doesn't matter because we've got the tabling motion anyway, which takes precedence. All right. So there's a motion to second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1984 is **TABLED (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**. Thank you. It sound like there are productive meetings going on.

2076, Directing the Department of Public Works to solicit proposals to provide a temporary land and traffic safety equipment and personnel along County Road 39 on Friday evenings during peak traffic times in 2007.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will table this.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. On the motion. This has to do now •• this is just for Friday evenings. Now we know •• I think the last time we talked about this, we had problems nighttime issues. And I think we've overcome a lot of the nighttime issues; is that right, because we're setting up the cones ••

MR. ANDERSON:

Again, if we do the nighttime, there's the issue of access to the, you know, businesses that are on the north side of the road. You know, how do we •• it becomes a little bit more problematic only because at some point we have stop the operation. And during the day now, we're collecting them •• we would essentially have to shut down the highway from what I'm told to collect them.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe we can resolve those issues. Ultimately, I wanted to be able to provide some of the same relief to our second homeowners and our tourists as we're providing to our workforce, particularly July and August when Friday nights are just a disaster, there's just so much traffic backed up. And it's •• I think it's an important engine of our economy, that whole •• you know, the Hamptons tourist economy.

But the reason I put this through as an RFP was so •• thinking that the County couldn't do it themselves, that we would need to use a road construction type of company. Now, it seems clear that it actually is possible for the County to do it using their own labor, the question is will they and would we fund it, and can we overcome some of the specific technical hurdles that are involved in a Friday evening operation. So I don't know that we need to proceed with soliciting

proposals, unless you are going to tell me you'd like to see that to have that type of data. If not, you know, we'll stick with tabling it, and we can still look at that issue of Friday night operations within the context of having DPW employees conduct them.

MR. ANDERSON:

Short of, I mean, the initial question of funding it, I do have some concern about the nighttime operation. Again, I don't •• off the top of my head, I don't know have what the volumes are that •• you know, you're talking about two different types of volumes, two different types of traffic. I mean, you have labor coming in during the morning. In the evening you have, you know, a lot of, as you said, second home residents, you know. For the time that's left •• and I have to also, you know, remind you that next year, we will be in construction. So there are going to be other components that are going to be involved with this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Hopefully not in the summertime to affect this.

MR. ANDERSON:

I hope not.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you give me some, just, data on Friday nights? Now it's going to start to slow down, but if you have some of the Friday night data as compared to the, you know, Monday through Friday morning data. I don't know if you've ever done any data collection during the evenings, like, 7:00 to 9:00, 7:00 to 10:00.

MR. ANDERSON:

We can certainly look with the ongoing study that's going on now and find if there's any information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If not, if there's a way to gather that data so we can look at some of those volumes, I'd appreciate it. Anyway, I've made a motion to table and there was a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2076 is **TABLED. (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

2095. Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a feasibility study for the construction of a pedestrian bridge over William Floyd Parkway in Shirley.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Browning, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. Legislator Browning or Mr. Anderson, do you have some idea how much this would cost?

MR. ANDERSON:

Yes. Based on 1991 construction from the pedestrian bridge that was built on County Road 19, in 2006 dollars it would run about 2.6 million to build this.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Two point six million. Now, that's based on the inflated cost of the '91 •• County Road 19 is Holbrook•Patchogue Road?

MR. ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. And I remember the Legislator that brought that pedestrian bridge forward that at the time

cost \$1.1 million, Legislator Levy at the time. Yes. And sent the then County Executive into a tailspin, but nevertheless, he approved it. I drive passed that every time, but I don't see too many pedestrians on that bridge.

MR. ANDERSON:

I mean, that's one of the observations from that bridge is that it is not well used, you know, the existing County Road •• I'm sorry, the existing pedestrian bridge.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. Right. It's just before Holbrook County Club, as I recall, and there's a small residential development. That was about 1.1, 1.2 when it was first proposed in 1989 by Legislator Levy. However, Kate, where along William Floyd Parkway would this be erected?

LEG. BROWNING:

I've had a number of complaints and concerns from constituents. I think you probably remember the incident with the lady crossing over ••

LEG. ROMAINE:

Absolutely.

LEG. BROWNING:

•• and her child getting hit in the stroller. Based on that, I have had questions about why can't we

have it there by the railroad tracks? I see it often. And people are crossing over there, and there's too many incidents going on. Also, further down ••

LEG. ROMAINE:

By the library.

LEG. BROWNING:

By the library, yes. And also, there are children crossing William Floyd Parkway to go to school if they miss their bus.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's a heavily •• heavily pedestrian criss•crossed road.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, there is.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Much more so than Holbrook.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's very long. And I know •• I thanked DPW in advance, because I know I spoke with Bill Hillman about extending the crosswalks, and they did extend the crosswalk time, but they are very wide roads.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there a light there?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. There's a light, but it's a four•lane highway. And we have too many children crossing that road. So I am very interested in finding out if that •• if it is a possible thing for us to do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I've got, I guess, a question, both to the sponsor and to DPW. Having just gone through a visioning process associated with County Road 16 and, you know, several different scenarios associated with construction and configuration there, I'm aware that County Road 80 at this point is under a similar type of evaluation or an analysis process, is there some attempt to look at something along this line involved with that reconstruction associated with County Road 80? William Floyd and Montauk Highway intersect right there, and that's the general vicinity that you are describing for construction of this pedestrian bridge, correct? Is there any opportunity to involve this analysis with that evaluation?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Mr. Hillman.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't think the evaluation of a pedestrian bridge should be included in the CR 80 project. However, the CR 80 project will be installing a traffic signal just north of the railroad tracks, which given the proper pedestrian signals that will be installed there, could be utilized in lieu of a pedestrian bridge.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Again, the only reason that I throw this back out to you is because I know that when we're operating with use of Federal Highway Funds, we generally have a much broader and wider view associated with doing not only work that will benefit vehicular traffic, but ancillary traffic as well; handicapped individuals, bicyclists, pedestrians, any and all type of folks that are going to be, you know, secondary to the roads.

So I'm wondering if, you know, there may not be this ability to go ahead and get that, you know, enhanced additional piece. I'll turn to my •• my friend, Mr. Zwirn, who says that we always have to find a way to pay for these things. So perhaps by some creative thinking there may be an opportunity to pay for this evaluation, because I don't know how much the study is. I know what the cost is to construct the bridge. BRO is here to tell us what the cost of the study is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're going to do it in•house, I think.

MR. HILLMAN:

We would hire out for a consultant for something of this nature. We're estimating, and this is a rough estimate, somewhere in the neighborhood of say 50,000 for a study. And the reason why I would discourage including it in the CR 80 is that there are so many other issues there that this would really get lost in the shuffle, so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Again, I defer to the sponsor. Certainly it's outside of my district. I would, you know, offer it just as food for thought. But in the alternative, if it's 50,000 to study this, then I guess we would be making a decision that here it's worth spending 50,000 as opposed to some of the other things we just spoke about.

MR. ANDERSON:

I would also state that as part of that development project, they do look at pedestrian issues, it's not just a matter of road issues. So they would •• you know, the state generally mandates that you have to do something, you know, the least cost for the best benefit. From the history that we have seen on the existing bridge on County Road 19, it's a very low use. And where you have signals, most people are going to walk across the road, you know, without having to go up •• you know, each of those ramps is about a thousand feet.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The volume, though, is nowhere near the same on County Road 19 and County Road 80. County Road 80 as a matter of fact is inundated similar to County Road 16 for several hours a day. County Road 19 notwithstanding whatever the history was as far as who the sponsor was and his ability to get it constructed just doesn't not have the same volume of traffic.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So I don't know that comparison holds there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do you have an outside consultant line with \$50,000 in it that you are planning on using for this?

MR. ANDERSON:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because this resolution has no funding attached to it. So how are you planning on paying for it if we approve it?

MR. ANDERSON:

(Shrugging shoulders).

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What do you want to do? You want to table it or approve it?

LEG. BROWNING:

Is there money for funding?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We don't have funding for it. We have a problem. If it was in•house •• I mean, you want to try to do this in•house, or is it impossible?

LEG. BROWNING:

Is it not possible to do an in•house study? Come on, Bill.

MR. HILLMAN:

We could add it to our study list, and I think we have already have added it to our study list at your original request. So I thought the intent of this was to, you know, go out to a consultant for additional study.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Does it have a turn•around time?

MR. HILLMAN:

I can say that due to the experience that we have had with CR 19 and the past history of pedestrian bridges all over the country, that it would be difficult for us to find a proper location. Knowing that roadway, there's not one specific pedestrian generator. I think through this discussion, we named three or four minor pedestrian generators. And you would be looking at three or four pedestrian bridges.

When a traffic signal is, and possibly improving the pedestrian mobility at traffic signals, may be the most appropriate thing to do for a corridor. Pedestrian bridges are very difficult. So if this •• if this was modified to include analyzing pedestrian mobility along the corridor not specifically for a pedestrian bridge, I think that's a very positive step in the right direction, and I would encourage that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Chairman, that's exactly the argument that Bart Cass made to Legislator Levy in this Legislature, and he remained undeterred and felt that that pedestrian bridge was key for his district and was prepared spend the money. And somehow we found it all. And the County Executive at the time, despite his objections, Pat Halpin did sign the bill, and then shortly after, Legislator Levy introduced the roll•back bill to cut all the patronage positions in Mr. Halpin's administration.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Where are we going with this? Should we table it and amend the bill?

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion the approve, I guess.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. There's still a motion to •• has there been a motion and a second to approve?

MR. BAKER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There has been, right? Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. Are we saying that it cost •• what was it, \$2.3 million?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Two point six.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Two point six million dollars to construct a bridge; is that correct?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Back in '91.

MR. ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It costs \$2.6 million to put a bridge over William Floyd Parkway?

MR. HILLMAN:

One point two million for the bridge that we constructed on County Road 19 back in 1991.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Was that an RFP process?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, that was. We estimate that a similar bridge in today's dollars would cost about 2.6 million.

LEG. D'AMARO:

To put a pedestrian bridge over a roadway?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, since the bill has no funding, we'd assumed this was an in-house study, the bill calls •• has 180 day turnaround time, that's six months, you said you could potentially add this to your list. Is that practical, feasible to complete this in a 180 days?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me just get an answer, then I will give it to you, Legislator Kennedy.

MR. ANDERSON:

If I could interject here. I mean, obviously we could do it, but that again means that other things

would have to be pushed to the side. I mean, our •• you know, our services are taxed right now, so.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah. Now, I will weigh in on something that's important in my district as a matter of fact. There are several initiatives from DPW that they're attempting to work through at this point right now in •house that can only be done and can only be done •• that are critical to projects in my district. And I think it's unreasonable to expect that this office, which is a finite number of resources, is going to be able to continue to meet some of these things that we enact and pass across the, you know, the bow here. It's like just throwing more ballast on a sinking ship. It's just not logical, it's not practical, and it's not realistic.

I think that •• you know, I applaud Legislator Browning for going ahead to look at solutions for what's clearly a five•lane hazardous traffic intersection, but, you know, to pass a resolution that's going to go out there and sit on a pile that grows ever higher is fruitless. It just doesn't •• it lacks merit and it lacks sense.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I will withdraw my motion, and I will make a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right.

LEG. BROWNING:

So I will speak with DPW to see what we can come up with on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A light at the end of the tunnel, or a bridge in this case. All right. So there's a motion to table.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And a second by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2095 is **TABLED (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**.

Thank you, Legislator Browning. And I'm sure you will be talking more with DPW and amending the resolution. Okay.

2132, Appropriating funds in connection with the installation of Emergency Systems for Major County Buildings/ NYS Fire Standards (CP 1710).

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a motion to approve by Legislator Eddington.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. On the motion, can we have an explanation?

MR. CALDERONE:

Capital Program 1710 is our ongoing, basically, safety systems Capital Program. And it entails fire alarm systems, security systems, etcetera. This particular \$170,000, I believe, is really dedicated for upgrading Police Headquarters, which has a very, very antiquated fire alarm system, and the Cornell Cooperative in Yaphank to •• not upgrade, but actually do an initial installation of fire alarm systems in some of their classrooms where they bring in students from elementary schools and middle schools. So that's really what the money is for.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. Okay any other questions all right so we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2132 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 7•0•0•0)**.

2133, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with assessment of Information System and Equipment for Public Works (CP 5060).

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, if we can have an explanation.

MR. ANDERSON:

On this one I'm going to have to defer to Sharon Cates•Williams.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let's do motion and a second so it's before us.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to approve.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There's a motion by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Horsley. On the motion, Sharon, if you would explain, please.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

This is to purchase equipment to update the existing system that's there that's over five years old. And the department has grown considerably since the first •• since the existing equipment was placed there. So this new system will purchase and provide redundancy. It's going to purchase six clustered servers, five 300 gigabyte drives that should be more than enough to accommodate the 350 department users plus all of the data that they have out there. They have a lot of mapping •• a lot of maps and plans.

It will buy a rack with sufficient UPS units to keep everything cooled, a new •• two new tape drives so that they can backup all of their data, and there's installation and configuration costs included. And I would just like to point out that the original request was more much more than this, but I have consolidated their Oracle applications to the Hauppauge data center so that reduced the original request amount.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. Thank you. So primarily this order then is only associated with hardware, or you are going to actually be loading some software applications as well?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

This is hardware. That is correct. Servers, drives, the rack, the tape system and install config of all that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm not sure I quite understand, though, as far as the Oracle application itself.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Well, the original request was for two additional servers for their Oracle data that's currently running out of there now, but I have consolidated that data over to the Hauppauge data center so they don't need that anymore.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, in other words, the database itself don't reside in Yaphank any more, it now resides here in Hauppauge?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Yes. Just the Oracle stuff, that is correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And how is the communication going at this point between Yaphank and here?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

One hundred megabytes seems to be fine.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, in other words, that's a regular fiber line that we have from running here out to Yaphank?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is that a sole line, or do we have some redundancy?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

We have redundancy. Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So there are multiple lines in the event that we have one that fails?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

They still have the ability maintain and continue their operations?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

We would like to do the same thing for Riverhead.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes. We would like that too.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I would love to see that for Riverhead as well, because, as you know, with the tie-in from Hauppauge to Riverhead, there's been periods of •• considerable periods considering of what people have become accustomed to of downtime. So there will be no downtime now that the Oracle data base for DPW is now residing in Hauppauge?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

We don't anticipate any downtime.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Not like Riverhead.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Not like Riverhead.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Thank you.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

And actually, in Riverhead, it's mostly the internet that is down, and we're working on that too.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. Okay. Thank you. Although that affects the title industry tremendously.

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

Yes, it does.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

In terms of the cost in this resolution, this is a budgeted item. Are we changing the numbers at all? Have we added to it?

MS. CATES•WILLIAMS:

No. We're not changing anything.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. They're amending the Capital Budget.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We're just appropriating.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MS. GAZES:

Actually, the amendment portion refers to a redirection of funding that was originally all in planning. It's now split between planning and equipment. There is a minor \$5,000 discrepancy. It actually shows it going down, so we are missing \$5,000 actually in the presentation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Okay. We had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2133 is **approved (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

2139, To dedicate corner of Pulaski Road and New York Avenue in Huntington as the “Carmen Ramos Calixto•Laas Corner”.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well done, Mr. Chairman. I believe this ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes. I'm sorry. I believe this has to be tabled because it needs to go through the ••

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Naming Committee.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Naming Committee, yes. So I will offer a motion to table.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Hang on a second. Can we do a motion to table before we have done a motion to approve?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. That take precedence, in fact.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It wasn't even before us yet. Normally we have •• I guess you can make a motion to table.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I was thinking of something else. There is motion to table and •• who was the second to table? Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2139 **tabled (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).**

2171, A Local Law to establish a Safe and Sustainable Procurement Policy.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to table for a public hearing.

LEG. EDDINGTON:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table, seconded by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

TABLED (VOTE: 7•0•0•0).

There's a motion to adjourn. We're adjourned.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:35 P.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY

